

Application No.: 10/008553

Docket No.: MWS-009

REMARKS

Claims 1, 13, 15, 18, 20, 25, 32, 34 and 41 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added. Thus claims 1-42 are presently pending in the application.

Specification Objection

Applicants have amended claims 13 and 32 to remove "at least" from the limitation and believe the specification now supports the claims.

Indications of Allowability

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowability of claims 17, 19 and 22 as well as the indication of allowance of claims 5-7, and 9-10. However, Applicants have amended claim 15, upon which claim 17 is dependent, claim 18, upon which claim 19 is dependent and claim 20, upon which claim 22 is dependent, as set forth below. Accordingly, Applicants, are not amending claims 17, 19 and 22 at this time.

Rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4, 13-16, 18, 20, 23-24, 25-28, 32-37, 41 and 42 were rejected as being anticipated by Schatz et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5, 845, 270, hereafter Schatz et al). In light of the amendments above and for the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Summary of Claimed Invention

The claimed invention provides a method of reconciling and merging two displayed electronic diagrams into one electronic diagram. After differences between corresponding areas of the two electronic diagrams are detected, the claimed invention provides a mechanism for merging different features of a first diagram into a second diagram. The second diagram may receive and merge all of the differences identified from the first diagram, or only selected differences. Distinctions are made between graphical and functional feature differences in the two diagrams. The claimed invention enables the user to specify which type of feature

Application No.: 10/008553

Docket No.: MWS-009

differences should be merged (i.e., graphical differences, functional differences, both graphical and functional differences, or individually selected differences regardless of the classification).

Summary of Schatz et al

Schatz describes a system for modeling resource flows through systems. Systems and the resources flowing through the systems are modeled so as to determine associations between the systems and to organize information about the systems. The system objects, resource objects and the relationships between the system objects and resource objects may be used to create a network diagram so as to allow a graphical analysis of the relationships. Schatz also discusses a method of interconnecting two or more network diagrams to form a single merged network diagram.

Summary of Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended claims 13, 32 and 41 to indicate that the diagrams being merged are one of the enumerated types of diagrams rather than "at least one" the types of diagrams.

Applicants have also amended independent claim 1, upon which claims 2-4, 8 and 11-14 are dependent, claim 15, upon which claims 16-17 are dependent, claim 20, upon which claims 21-24 are dependent and claim 34, upon which claims 35-42 are dependent, to indicate that the determined differences are categorized as functional differences or graphical differences prior to being merged.

Applicants have also amended independent claim 18, upon which claim 19 is dependent, and claim 25, upon which claims 26-33 are dependent, to indicate that the semantic connection connects components within the same system in the diagram.

Argument

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 15, 20 and 34 to indicate that the determined differences are categorized as functional differences or graphical differences prior to

Application No.: 10/008553

Docket No.: MWS-009

merging. As the Examiner indicated in his allowance of claim 5, Schatz et al does not make this distinction. Accordingly, Applicants believe claims 1-4, 8, 11-14, 15-17, 20-24 and claims 34-42 are now in condition for allowance and requests the rejections directed to these claims be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

The Examiner indicated in rejecting claims 18 and 25 that the semantic limitation had a broad meaning that encompassed a referenced subsystem in the electronic diagram such that the claims were anticipated by Schatz. Applicants have amended claims 18 and 25 to clarify that the semantic connection associates components within the same system in an electronic diagram. Schatz lacks this limitation. Accordingly, Applicants request the rejections directed towards claims 18, 20, 25-28 and 32-33 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8, 11-12, 29-31 and 38-40 were rejected as being obvious over Schatz et al, in view of Hsu (United States Patent No. 5, 845, 270, hereafter Hsu). Claims 8, 11 and 12 all depend directly or indirectly upon claim 1. As previously discussed above, the merge process of Schatz et al does not distinguish between functional and graphical differences. Since Hsu (which is cited to provide a highlighting limitation) does not provide the missing limitation either, the combination of Schatz et al and Hsu does not render claims 8, 11 and 12 obvious and Applicants submit that those claims are now also in condition for allowance. Similarly, claims 38 and 40 are dependent upon amended claim 34 and should be allowed for the same reason. Claims 29-31 are dependent upon amended claim 25 and Applicants respectfully suggest that the claims should be allowed for the same reason as claim 25 which was discussed above as Hsu does not teach or suggest the limitation of a semantic connection connecting components within the same system in the diagram.

Application No.: 10/008553

Docket No.: MWS-009

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims 1- 42 in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-009 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: June 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John S. Curran

Registration No.: 50,445

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP

28 State Street

Boston, Massachusetts 02109

(617) 227-7400

(617) 742-4214 (Fax)

Attorney/Agent For Applicant